APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,491	06/18/2001	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010545US1	4147

7590 03/12/2004		EXAMINER
Duke W. Yee		NGUYEN, ANH T
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2127	

P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

Specification

2.   The following claims are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 5, "is in a form a of", should recite, --is in a form of a --, and

"information presented", should recite, -- information is presented--,

Claim 8, "The method of clam 1", should recite, --The method of claim 1--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-2, 8-10, 13-15, 21-23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by McDonough et al. ("McDonough", US 5,991,878).

As per **claims 1, 2,** and **9** McDonough teaches a method in a data processing system for

managing confidential information in a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

Receiving and presenting confidential information within a history generated by a

browser in the graphical user interface to form a presentation (col.3, lines 41-48; *user being*

presented with pages of information after authorized to access);

receiving a user input (col. 3, lines 44-46) ; and

manipulating the confidential information using the user input (col.3, lines 41-48;).

As per **claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches wherein the confidential information includes at least one of a phone number, a credit card number, a social security number, and address of a user, a user identification, a password, and a personal identification number to gain access to other secure information (Fig. 2A, *step 1040*, col.3, lines 42-44).

As per **claim 10**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches wherein the history includes a cookie file, a cache for storing data associated with Web pages, a location list, and a history list (Fig.1, *cookie memory, browser*; Fig.4, *WS Memory, Back-End Memory*).

Claims 13 and 26 are similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, McDonough teaches a data processing system comprising: a bus system; a communications unit connected to the bus system; a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and a processing unit connected to the bus system (Fig.1).

Claims 14, 15, and 22 are similar in scope to claims 1, 2, and 9, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 23 are similar in scope to claims 8 and 10, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

5.   Claims 3-4, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McDonough et al., ("McDonough", US 5,991,878), in view of Scarborough et al.,

("Scarborough", US 6,353,448).

As per **claim 3**, which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches the presentation of

pages of confidential information. McDonough does not teach wherein the presentation is in a

form of a set of thumbnails, wherein each thumbnail represents a Web page containing a portion

of the confidential information. Scarborough teaches wherein the presentation is in a form of a

set of thumbnails, wherein each thumbnail represents a Web page (Fig.8, col.10, lines 43-45). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the graphical user

interface presentation of confidential information as taught by McDonough and the thumbnails

representing web pages taught by Scarborough so that users could determine pertinent

information at a glance without actually bringing up the page.

As per **claim 4**, which is dependent on claim 3, Scarborough teaches responsive to a

selection of a particular thumbnail from the set of thumbnails, displaying a Web page associated

with the particular thumbnail (col.4, lines 58-67).

Claim 16 and 17 are similar in scope to claims 3-4, and therefore are rejected under

similar rationale.

6.   Claims 5-7, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McDonough et al., ("McDonough", US 5,991,878), in view of Berstis, (US 6,243,091).

As per **claims 5-7,** which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches the invention

substantially as claimed. However, McDonough does not teach wherein the presentation is in a

form of a tree and wherein the information is presented as nodes in the tree. Berstis teaches

wherein the presentation is in a form of a tree and wherein the information is presented as nodes

in the tree (Fig.8, col.11, lines 12-14), each node within the nodes represents an object containing

a portion of the confidential information and wherein the object includes at least one of a Web

page and a cookie (col.11, line 19) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention include the tree structure taught by Berstis in the method as taught by

McDonough because the tree data structure with its nodes are easily adaptable to represent web

pages associated with the information for ease of mapping each object to that portion of the

confidential information it corresponds to, thereby making it more intuitive to the user.

Claims 18-20 are similar in scope to claims 5-7, and therefore are rejected under similar

rationale.

7.   Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

McDonough et al., ("McDonough", US 5,991,878), in view of D. Kristol et al., ("Kristol",

Network Working Group RFC 2109, "HTTP State Management Mechanism", 13 pages,

February 1997).

As per **claim 11-12,** which is dependent on claim 1, McDonough teaches the invention

substantially as claimed. However, McDonough does not specifically teach wherein the user

input is to delete a selected portion of the confidential information and wherein the selected

portion is all of the confidential information. Kristol teaches wherein the user input is to delete a

selected portion of the confidential information and wherein the selected portion is all of the

confidential information (Page 16, section 7.1, *User Agent Control, control mechanism to give*

the user control in deciding which cookies should be saved). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the control mechanism of Kristol

in the method as taught by McDonough because it allows the user to safeguard against

unauthorized access to the user's private confidential information and prevent identity theft.

Claims 24-25 are similar in scope to claims 11-12, and therefore are rejected under

similar rationale.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

a) McDonough et al., USPN 5,991,878 teaches controlling access to information in a
   browser session..

b) Berstis, USPN 6,243,091 teaches browser history in a global history window.

c) Scarborough et al., USPN 6,353,448 teaches a graphic user interface display
   method for web pages in reduced form (thumbnails).

d) D. Kristol et al., Network Workinging Group RFC, "HTTP State Management
   Mechanism", 13 pages, February 1997.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Anh T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8649. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am-4:00pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Anh T. Nguyen

Art Unit 2127

March 8, 2004